Message

From: Paula Schmittdiel [Schmittdiel.PaulaLNDU@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 7/11/2012 10:33:18 PM
To: Murray, Bill [Murray.Bill@epa.gov]
CC: Richard Sisk [Sisk.Richard@epa.gov]; Wharton, Steve [Wharton.Steve@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Fw: topics for the EPA meeting on Thursday

Bill - Richard Sisk is out of the office this week and I'm not sure how long he has been involved with VB/I-70. I don't really know how it was identified that the RI was deficient - especially since someone at EPA apparently had approved the RI.

I have asked the SFRC to look in the file for the date of the final RI report, any letter/e:mail that would have been sent to the City/County of Denver approving the RI report and any internal documentation - e:mail that would have indicated how/why we decided that the RI was in fact not sufficient.

Andrew has provided me with some e:mails between he and Sam Garcia outlining his concerns with the RI report but those start in January of 2011 with no indication as to what precipitated Sam's request for Andrew's review.

I'll see what SFRC can find and let you know - hopefully before the meeting tomorrow.

Paula Schmittdiel
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1595 Wynkoop St.
Denver, Co 80202
303-312-6861 (office)
303-312-7151 (fax)
720-951-0795 (cell)

From: Bill Murray/R8/USEPA/US

To: "Steve Wharton" <Wharton.Steve@epamail.epa.gov>, "Paula Schmittdiel" <Schmittdiel.Paula@epamail.epa.gov>, "Richard Sisk" <Sisk.Richard@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 07/11/2012 03:06 PM
Subject: Fw: topics for the EPA meeting on Thursday

Please provide me asap w some answers to the issues raised below for our mtg tomorrow w the city.

From: "Nightengale, Alice - Environmental Health" [Alice.Nightengale@denvergov.org]

Sent: 07/11/2012 02:15 PM CST

To: Bill Murray

Subject: topics for the EPA meeting on Thursday

Hi Bill, Paula sent over the language for the environmental notice and I'm hoping Jackie will look at it before our meeting on Thursday.

Our main issue with VBI70 is that fact that we are revisiting a site where we have a signed AOC and an approved RI and an approved FS, none of which identify groundwater as a concern. My understanding of Superfund Law is that a site can be reopened on the basis of new information. There was no new information on VBI70 that would lead to questions regarding the conclusions in the approved documents. So, why is the EPA ignoring the fact that we have complied with all of the terms of the AOC in collaboration with the CDPHE and the EPA without any new information to inform that decision?

I'd like to talk about two things on Lowry:

1. Getting the recommended protective Five-Year Review approved
2. EPA taking a stronger position on the State and CLLEAN and having them focus on the important aspects of the site rather than have the PRPs spend resources on hypotheses.

Alice Nightengale | Environmental Public Health Manager
Environmental Health | City and County of Denver
720.865.5431 Phone | 720.865.5534 Fax